

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/519,407	Applicant(s) NAITOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Patricia L. Hailey	Art Unit 1755	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Patricia L. Hailey. (3) Hiroshi Kon (Patent Counsel).
 (2) Harris Pitlick (Applicants' Counsel). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: May 24, 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kasuga et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,458,740) and Japanese Patent No. 2000-296336.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, in addition to the criticality in the employment of three separate solutions, and in the length of time that said solutions are mixed (in particular, the mixing time of the solution defined as "liquid B" in the instant claims), were discussed. Additionally, a web-generated English translation of the above Japanese Patent was provided to Applicants' Counsel. Upon the filing of a response to the outstanding Office Action, all pending claims will be reconsidered. .